UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/836,584	04/16/2001	Christopher E. Mitchell	MS1-775US	7869

22801 7590 10/06/2004

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER	
TRUONG, THANHNGA B	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2135	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/836,584	MITCHELL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thanhnga Truong	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 April 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-47* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-47* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 April 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Baker et al (US 5,678, 041).

a. *Referring to claim 1:*

i. Baker teaches:

(1) associating a first entity with a second entity in a first device **[i.e., as shown in Figure 1, the system includes public network 100, network resources 101-105, and user site 106. Particular users at user site 106 gain access to public network 100 via user terminals 107, 108 and 109. Each of these user terminals is linked by local area network ("LAN") 110 to processor 111 within proxy server 112 (column 3, lines 60-65)]**; and

(2) selectively providing information about the association of the first and second entities to a second device as directed by the first entity, without requiring the second entity to be operatively associated with either the first or second device **[i.e., relational database 114 stores a list of user terminal identification codes and the various user clearances reflective of the ratings of network resources that each user terminal should be allowed to retrieve from public network 100. It will be understood that the invention could be modified so that the list of user clearances associated with a given user terminal identification code serves as a restrictive list (i.e.; that user is not allowed to retrieve network resources having that rating). This restrictive listing functionality could be readily facilitated by reprogramming processor 111. In addition, the invention**

could be modified so that the identification codes recognized by processor 111 and stored in relational database 114 are user specific, as opposed to user terminal specific. In other words, the system of Figure 1 could be modified so that a given individual using a terminal is identified to the system by a personal password or other identifying code. Access or denial of the transmission of particular URLs is effected by the system as a function of that person's identity, regardless of the particular user terminal they may be utilizing (column 5, lines 45-65)].

b. *Referring to claim 2:*

i. Baker further teaches:

(1) wherein the first entity and the second entity are selected from a group of entities that includes users, organizations, companies, devices, computers, servers, computer programs, and applications **[i.e., as shown in Figure 1, the system includes public network 100, network resources 101-105, and user site 106 (column 3, lines 60-61)].**

c. *Referring to claims 3-8, 33-36, 39, 41-44:*

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 1, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

d. *Referring to claim 9:*

i. Baker further teaches:

(1) wherein the first entity is a parent/guardian of the second entity **[i.e., Baker's invention overcomes the deficiencies of prior schemes for regulating network database access by providing a system and method that allows one or more network administrators/managers, that is "parent/guardian", to rate particular information and/or services. This rating is then employed to restrict specific system users from accessing the information/services via certain public or otherwise uncontrolled databases (i.e., the WWW and the Internet) (column 3, lines 7-15)].**

e. *Referring to claim 10:*

i. Baker further teaches:

(1) wherein the first device includes a network server that is configured to act as an authentication server **[i.e., proxy server 112 provides a connection from processor 111 to public network 100 via firewall 113. Requests from user terminals 107-109 for access to network resources (101-105) through public network 100 are submitted to processor 111 within proxy server 112. In this particular embodiment of the invention, the submitted requests are assumed to be in the form of URLs. When URLs are submitted to a proxy server (that is "authentication server"), the particular requesting user terminal is identified to the proxy server by an identification header attached to the URL. (column 3, line 65 through column 4, line 9)].**

f. *Referring to claim 11:*

i. Baker further teaches:

(1) wherein the second device includes a network server that is configured to act as an affiliated server associated with the authentication server **[i.e., within the system of Figure 1, URLs designated as URL.sub.101, URL.sub.102, URL.sub.103, URL.sub.104 and URL.sub.105, represent requests for information from network resources 101, 102, 103, 104 and 105 (these are "affiliate servers"), respectively (column 4, lines 12-16)].**

g. *Referring to claims 12, 32:*

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 1, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

h. *Referring to claims 13, 38:*

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 2, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

i. *Referring to claims 14-19:*

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 12, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 12 above.

j. *Referring to claims 20, 29, 45:*

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 9, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 9 above.

k. *Referring to claims 21,30, 47:*

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 10, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 10 above.

l. *Referring to claims 22, 31, 46:*

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 11, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 11 above.

m. *Referring to claim 23:*

i. Baker teaches:

(1) memory having information associating a first user of the apparatus with a second user of the apparatus **[i.e., as shown in Figure 1, the system includes public network 100, network resources 101-105, and user site 106. Particular users at user site 106 gain access to public network 100 via user terminals 107, 108 and 109. Each of these user terminals is linked by local area network ("LAN") 110 to processor 111 within proxy server 112 (column 3, lines 60-65). The above described system may also be modified so that URLs are identified as being in a rating category within the memory structure of a relational database (column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 1)]**; and

(2) logic operatively coupled to the memory and configured to respond to inputs from the first user by selectively outputting the information about the association of the first user and the second user, without requiring the second user to be operatively signed-in to the apparatus **[i.e., for example, if a system manager wished to modify relational database 302 from user terminal 108, he or she would enter a password identifying themselves as an authorized system manager. The password is received by processor 111 and compared with the contents of manager ID memory listing 304. If the received manager ID password corresponds to one stored in listing 304, then user terminal 108 is identified as a manager terminal (as indicated by ID.sub.108 being stored within listing 304). Modifications to the contents of relational database 302 may then be effected from that user terminal. When all modifications have been completed, the manager logs off and user terminal 108 returns to standard user terminal**

status (i.e., ID.sub.108 is cleared from listing 304) (column 7, lines 3-16 and claim 1 (2))].

n. *Referring to claim 24:*

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 23, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 23 above.

o. *Referring to claims 25-28:*

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 23, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 23 above.

p. *Referring to claims 37, 40:*

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 23, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 23 above.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Zenchelsky et al (US 6, 233, 686) discloses a system and method for providing peer-level access control on networks that carry packets of information, each packet having a 5-tuple having a source and destination address, a source and destination port, and a protocol identifier (see abstract).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 703-305-0327.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 703-305-4393. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

TC 2100 will be moved to Carlyle in October 2004, the new telephone number for TC 2100 receptionist is 571-272-2100. In October 2004, any

inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose new telephone number is 571-272-3858, and the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859.

TBT
September 30, 2004

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXA
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 21